

Transmitted Via Facsimile to (571) 273-8300

PATENT
138543 (553-1077)

Remarks

Claims 6, 7, 9, 26, and 27 are currently pending in this Application. Claims 6, 7, 9, 26, and 27 have been canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 28-47 are newly added herein. No new matter has been entered. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 28-47 will be pending in this application. It is respectfully submitted that the claims define allowable subject matter.

Claims 6, 7, 26, and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,619,998 (Abdel-Malek) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,879,729 (Kamath), and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,674,879 (Weisman). Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdel-Malek in view of Kamath, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,887,306 (Hwang). Applicant traverses these rejections for at least the reasons set forth hereafter.

With respect to independent claims 28, 36, 37, 38, 46, and 47, the Examiner has asserted that co-displaying first and second images that are speckle-reduced using the speckle reduction parameters of different first and second value sets is obvious based on Weisman. Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the reasons enumerated below.

With regard to whether co-displaying first and second images that are speckle-reduced using the speckle reduction parameters of different first and second value sets as being obvious in view of Weisman, the Examiner asserts that “[h]ere the combination is the predictable method of generating multiple speckle reduced versions of an image (light, moderate and heavy, col. 13 lines 1-6) and displaying them with the predictable method of simultaneously co-displaying multiple filtered versions of an image (figure 7), according to their established functions.” (Page 4 of the outstanding Office Action). Co-displaying first and second images that are speckle-reduced using different values sets of speckle reduction parameters is more than a predictable use of the co-displayed speckle reduced, edge detected, and color quantization images of Weisman. The Examiner has merely stated that generating and co-displaying multiple speckle reduced versions of an image is “predictable” based on Weisman because Weisman discloses that the amount of speckle of the speckle reduced image can be chosen as light, heavy, or moderate. However, one skilled in the art would not replace the speckle reduced, edge detected, and color

Transmitted Via Facsimile to (571) 273-8300

PATENT
138543 (553-1077)

quantization images of Weisman with multiple speckle reduced versions of the same raw image based on Weisman's disclosure that the amount of speckle can be selected as light, heavy, or moderate. The edge detected and color quantization images are both generated from the speckle reduced image. Therefore, the speckle reduced, edge detected, and color quantization images of Weisman are not "multiple filtered versions of a raw image" as asserted by the Examiner. Rather, the edge detected and color quantization images each include the same speckle reduction parameters as the speckle reduced image, whether such parameters are selected as light, heavy, or moderate. One skilled in the art would therefore not be motivated to replace the speckle reduced, edge detected, and color quantization images of Weisman with multiple speckle reduced versions of the same raw image merely because the speckle reduced image may initially be selected with light, heavy, or moderate speckle reduction. Merely stating that generating and co-displaying multiple speckle reduced versions of an image is "predictable" based on a general teaching of that a series of images may initially be selected with the same light, heavy, or moderate level of speckle reduction does not make a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, the Examiner has not satisfied the requirements of KSR. For at least the reasons set forth above, claims 28, 36, 37, 38, 46, and 47 are each submitted as patentable over the cited references.


Turning to the dependent claims, Hwang does not make up for the deficiencies of Abdel-Malek, Kamath, and Weisman at least with respect to independent claims 28, 36, 37, 38, 46, and 47. Applicant submits that dependent 29-35 and 39-45 each contain further recitations that are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Additionally, claims 29-35 and 39-45 depend from claims 28 and 38, respectively. Consequently, because claims 28 and 28 each define allowable subject matter, claims 29-35 and 39-45 also define allowable subject matter.

Transmitted Via Facsimile to (571) 273-8300

PATENT
138543 (553-1077)

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Charles H. Livingston, Reg. No. 53,933
THE SMALL PATENT LAW GROUP LLP
611 Olive, Suite 1611
St. Louis, MO 63101
(314) 584-4089
(314) 584-4061 (Fax)